DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 134 084 HE 008 558

TITLE	Mission Statement: State University of New York at Albany.
INSTITUTION	State Univ. of New York, Albany.
PUB DATE	Jan 77
NOTE	17p.; Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original
AVAILABLE FROM	State University of New York, Albany, New York
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Role; Educational Administration; *Educational Objectives; *Educational Planning; Educational Responsibility; Higher Education; Historical Reviews; *Policy Formation; Program Planning; Social Responsibility; *State Universities; *Student Development
IDENTIFIERS	*State University of New York Albany; SUNY

ABSTRACT

This mission statement expresses purposes of the State University of New York at Albany, and is the opening essay in a planning process that is the responsibility of the Office of Academic Planning. Focus is on the pertinent elements of mission and on criteria for institutional development. The statement contains the following: historical perspective; the concept of a university; the institutional setting; goals for student development; goals for societal development; programs and priorities; implementation of the university mission; and appendices delineating the academic and administrative priorities of the university for the current period. (LBH)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED134084

JANUARY 1977

MISSION STATEMENT

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT ALBANY

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 008 558

MISSION STATEMENT

State University of New York at Albany — January 1977

PREFACE

Universities are again in a time of major adjustment, from the period of unprecendented expansion which extended through the 1960's into the era of constraint and consolidation which faces them now. It is a painful time which tests whether universities will emerge – indeed, perhaps even *which* universities will emerge – in an adequately strong condition to continue the many roles that society has come to expect of them. It is a time of self-consciousness in higher education, a time in which institutions of learning are again probing their own fundamental purposes and asking how those purposes might be shaped to the constraints and opportunities of a new age.

This Mission Statement reflects the new mood. It attempts a contemporary expression of the purposes of the State University of New York at Albany. It is done for our own guidance so that we may move forward without loss of strength or character. It is openly reported for the understanding of the public that sustains us and receives our services.

The Mission Statement is the opening essay in a planning process which is the responsibility of the Office of Academic Planning, under the direction of Robert Shirley. The Statement was first issued September 8, 1976, under the title of a "Proposed Statement of Mission" and was accompanied by an invitation to faculty, students, alumni, and friends of the University to offer their reactions, criticisms, and suggestions for improvement. Many groups and individuals did respond. All responses were reviewed by the Council on Educational Policy of the University Senate, and the Council has recommended changes in the shape and substance of the document. (The Council report is on file in the University Senate Office.) The recommendations have been incorporated in this revised Mission Statement of January 7, 1977.

There has been a major change in the general organization of the document so that the concept of a university (now Part I) is given greater clarity. In addition, the Mission Statement proper now focuses more on the permanent elements of mission and on criteria for institutional development, with shorter-term applications of those criteria appearing as appendices. Other changes in format were adopted in order to improve readability.

More specific changes are these:

- *Introduction* – the historical perspective now appears in the introduction, followed by a statement of the purpose and scope of the complete document.
- *Part I: The Concept of a University* – this part states the values of universities generally and affirms the importance of those values at the University of Albany. The importance of excellence in undergraduate education and in teaching have been made more explicit, as well as the importance of quality in general.
- *Part II: The Institutional Setting* – two major elements of the institutional setting are discussed here: the SUNY system and location in the Capital District of New York. Public policy analysis as an institutional emphasis is discussed at greater length than in the original draft, in order to clarify the University's position on various issues raised by respondents.
- *Part III: Goals for Student Development* – this part has been revised substantially to be clearer about our obligations to the "whole person" and to discuss the goals of learning in more general terms. The Council deemed it inappropriate to include a detailed listing of specific learning objectives in a general campus-level mission statement.
- *Part IV: Goals for Societal Development* – the major change made in this part is elimination of detailed objectives under each goal, again because the Council thought the level of specificity too extensive for a general document.
- *Part V: Programs and Priorities* – this part combines Parts V and VI of the original draft and focuses on criteria for academic and administrative priority-setting, rather than on the priorities themselves.
- *Part VI: Toward Implementation* – the emphasis of this part is now on the process of planning by academic and administrative units, as well as the role of faculty, staff, and students in implementing the mission.
- *Appendices A and B* – the two appendices delineate the academic and administrative priorities of the University for the current period.

Academic and administrative units of the University are presently developing statements of their own objectives, along with three-year development plans, and these will be available for consideration in late January 1977. The campus level Mission Statement gives general guidance to these more concrete and particular reflections of campus planning activities. After January as the unit plans are reviewed, additional revisions in the campus-level statement may become warranted. Each year hereafter, we expect that the Council on Educational Policy will wish to reexamine these documents to determine whether any alterations in goals and priorities have become desirable.

The University is indebted, and I am personally grateful, to a great many persons whose labors are making this planning process a reality – to Dr. Shirley who directs it, to the Council on Educational Policy which is its constructive critic, to the many groups and individuals who are responding with helpful suggestions, to the schools and departments whose faculty and staff are working hard in behalf of strong unit plans, and to many others who wish the University success. Whatever this Mission Statement may offer in clarity and quality results from the fact that these people worked to make it so. I am keenly aware of my responsibilities as President in such a venture as this, and I assume personal responsibility for any shortcomings the planning process may still have. It is important, however, that we have begun.

Emmett B. Fields
President

January 7, 1977

INTRODUCTION

The University at Albany has a rich and eventful past, a past that has always been characterized by a strong focus upon education of high quality. Its reputation as an institution of higher education is strong and its list of notable graduates is lengthy. The mission of the institution reflects this persistent commitment to quality and to an academic reputation of strength.

The Growth of a College: 1844-1962

Founded in 1844 as the State Normal School (later changed to New York State Normal College), the institution's primary purpose for its first 60 years was the preparation of teachers for elementary and secondary schools. In 1905, the mission changed dramatically: all courses of study designed to prepare elementary school teachers were discontinued; admissions requirements were made essentially the same as those of other eastern colleges of good standing; and all students were required to pursue subjects deemed essential to a liberal education. Also in 1905, the institution was authorized to award the Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science degrees. Through these changes the College was committed to preparing a liberally educated person who was also competent to teach in the secondary schools.

The succeeding decades saw that commitment fulfilled. Under the leadership of William J. Milne, Abram R. Brubacher and John M. Sayles, a faculty noted for its devotion to liberal education was recruited; and the distinction between a "teachers' college" and a "college for teachers" was transformed from a semantic subtlety into an instructional reality. Though the size of the College changed little during this period, its intellectual development proceeded robustly, as evidenced by a lateral growth into the full range of arts and sciences and a vertical growth into masters programs geared to the continuing professional needs of teachers.

In 1948, along with its sister public institutions, the College became a part of the newly established State University of New York. Its primary mission remained unchanged, however, and it was not until September 1961 that the College enrolled its first class of undergraduate students in liberal arts programs which did not include any required study in teacher education. In 1962, the institution was designated as one of four university centers to be developed in the SUNY system. Thus began a rapid transition to a complex university center for graduate, professional, and undergraduate education.

The Growth of a University: 1962-1971

In the decade following its designation as a university center, the Albany campus experienced rapid growth in program offerings, enrollments, and resources. The number of academic departments tripled, enrollments and faculty quadrupled, library holdings increased tenfold, and a new physical plant was constructed and occupied. The growth was more than numeric and physical, of course, and the sense of quality expected of a major university permeated decisions made on program development, faculty recruitment, and student admissions. Visible evidence of the continued emphasis placed on quality during the growth era can be seen in the test scores of entering students, the scholarly achievements of faculty, the existence of numerous honor societies, and the high demand for admission at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. The initiation of a chapter of Phi Beta Kappa in March 1974 finds its roots in the insisted emphasis on quality throughout the new University's first decade.

The range of programs appropriate to a major university developed rapidly. By the end of the decade the University was offering 49 baccalaureate programs, 52 masters programs, and 28 programs at the doctoral level. Thus the dominant feature of the era was growth: not unplanned or undirected expansion, but growth on the broad front of program activity necessitated by the times.

Little attention had to be given to the question of institutional mission under such expansionist conditions, because existing programs were assured of continuing resources, and proposals for new or expanded programs had only to contend against each other for shares of an ever-increasing budget. When steady-state conditions emerged rather abruptly in the early 1970's, in New York and elsewhere, few institutions were prepared to adjust to the prospect of equilibrium or of decline in program activity. The University at Albany was no exception.

The Recent Past: 1971-Present

The University at Albany began earlier than most universities in facing up to the implications of steady-state financing, by adopting redeployment strategies in the early 1970's to cope with shifts in workload patterns resulting from the elimination of all distribution requirements for baccalaureate degrees. The redeployments were ad hoc in nature, however, and were based on a narrow assessment of the circumstances peculiar to one or more programs at the time, rather than being guided by a more comprehensive plan for institutional development.

The work of the Select Committee on Academic Program Priorities in 1975 represented a significant break with that pattern. That group recommended position redeployments and program cuts within a comprehensive assessment of academic programs in which no single recommendation was made final prior to an examination of the whole. The work of the Presidential Task Force on Priorities and Resources in early 1976 continued this approach to making resource allocation decisions.

While neither the Select Committee nor the Presidential Task Force was charged with delineating long-range developmental priorities for the campus, the work of both focused attention on the need for such a plan. The Select Committee anticipated that need in 1975 by warning the campus of the implications of limited resources:

> . . . In the view of the Select Committee, this University Center cannot continue to attempt a full speed "horizontal development" on all levels. It simply cannot do everything at once and do it well. It is the responsibility of all persons on this campus – administration, faculty, and students – to make a more effective case for increasing Albany's share of state tax dollars. But even under the most optimistic circumstances, we are not likely to see huge increases in faculty lines for the Albany campus in the near future. We must become much more selective in our goals and wisely choose among the options available . . .[1]

The harsh reality of a declining budget formed the context in which the Presidential Task force met in 1976 to determine options for the future. There was no fully developed mission statement available for guidance, as the Council on Educational Policy observed in its review of the Task Force's recommendations. Those recommendations had been undertaken on the assumption that a formal plan would be forthcoming, however, and the Council recommended that any future evaluations entailing resource redis-

1. Select Committee on Academic Program Priorities, "The General Report," May 15, 1975, p. 26.

tribution be done "in the context of a coherent institutional plan"

The future of the campus must be guided by more than a broad and generally unstated sense of purpose. Our circumstances in this regard are not unique; if any institution of higher education is to make effective use of increasingly scarce resources, decisions about those resources must reflect *prior* determinations on goals and developmental priorities. We must not only be more selective in our choices as to what is important but also ensure that those choices are subsequently reflected in budgetary decisions.

This Mission Statement is the beginning of a process for defining future directions of the University at Albany, a framework within which priority decisions can be made and implemented. It initiates the "coherent institutional plan" called for last year by the Council on Educational Policy.

The five parts of the Statement as printed here proceed from general educational values that shape the missions of all universities, to more concrete expressions of institutional purpose that are particular to the University at Albany, to criteria for setting priorities appropriate to institutional goals. The five parts are intended to have a degree of permanence that will allow reaching beyond the confines of yearly budget-making to the formulation of long-term development strategies. The institution's current priorities are presented, also, but since emphases are likely to be modified over a period of years, the immediate priorities are presented in two appendices.

This much of the Mission Statement anticipates its final and most important part – the goals of the schools, divisions, and departments of the University. Three-year plans, now being prepared by each academic and administrative unit, will be available for more general discussion in late January 1977. Those plans, when refined and approved for execution, will express concretely the newly-shaped mission of the University at Albany.

PART I: THE CONCEPT OF A UNIVERSITY

Institutions of higher learning may differ in many particulars, but they are inextricably bound by values which transcend considerations of location, ownership, and operational mode. The goals of the University at Albany must build upon and be shaped by the values of learning and scholarly inquiry which are at the heart of universities everywhere.

What are the principal values to which we are obligated as a university?

First is *a commitment to the discovery and advancement of knowledge*, for its own sake and for its practical benefits to society. Knowledge is an end in itself, the quest for which runs deep in the human spirit. Knowledge is also a source of enlightenment for the solution of many of society's problems, a force in the advancement of civilization. The world's great discoveries often occur in universities. The commitment to research and scholarly inquiry is the foundation of a university's unique role in society, and the wellspring of all of its functions.

A second fundamental obligation of a university is *a comitment to the teaching of students*, to their growth in knowledge, and to that reinforcement which will allow them to develop physically, emotionally, and socially as they grow intellectually. A university is obligated to stimulate in students a genuine excitement for learning and to equip them with a variety of intellectual strategies – in short, to provide a liberal education which aims at a larger self-fulfillment for every student. This holds true regardless of the chosen field of study, because specialized study without exposure to the ideas, principles, and theories central to all learning can only result in parochialism. A university affords also the specialized studies which lead to careers, particularly those professional careers which are based upon advanced knowledge. The entire intellectual, recreational, and social environment of the campus comes into play in giving life to such a learning experience. The goals for student development presented in Part III of this document reflect a commitment to education of the whole person.

A third distinguishing characteristic of a university is its *commitment to the larger society through acts which, for lack of a better term, we generally call "public service."* This function is peculiarly evident in American universities. Research and teaching contribute to the public good, of course, but faculty and students often reach beyond the confines of their classrooms and laboratories to engage directly in community affairs. A keener understanding of the public condition is one road to public betterment, and a university has contributions to make in this regard. Part IV of this document says more about "Goals for Societal Development."

Research, teaching, and public service are compatible functions which draw strength from each other. Faculty publish the results of their scholarship for the enlightenment of their peers throughout the world. They thus hold custody of the age-old process by which knowledge is kept alive and expanded into unknown realms.

An active research faculty excites students with learning, opens their minds to the imaginative and creative elements of inquiry, equips them with analytical methods for judging the truth, leads them to the frontiers of research knowledge, and urges them on into their own inquiries and fresh understandings. The research scholar who isolates himself from students in uninterrupted study belongs in a research organization of government or industry, and not in a university, because the hallmark of the university outlook is that research and teaching stimulate each other and should always proceed companionably. Research is, in much the same way, the wellspring of the public service function, the source from which come the analytic models which enable a better understanding of societal problems.

A fourth characteristic of a university is its *commitment to freedom of thought and inquiry*, and to the rights and obligations of faculty and students to pursue knowledge where it may lead. This basic value is essential to the advancement of knowledge, and to deny the right would be to imply that the results of scholarly inquiry, and the benefits to society, are entirely predictable in advance. The right to pursue one's own inquiries and freely to publish the results is an inviolable right of the investigator.

Freedom of thought and inquiry is just as essential to teaching as it is to research. The original statement on academic freedom prepared by the American Association of University Professors in 1915 argues the point convincingly:

> It is scarcely open to question that freedom of utterance is as important to the teacher as it is to the investigator. No man can be a successful teacher unless he enjoys the respect of his students, and their confidence in his intellectual integrity. It is clear, however, that this confidence will be impaired if there is suspicion on the part of the student that the teacher is not expressing himself fully or frankly, or that college and university teachers in general

are a repressed and intimidated class who dare not speak with that candor and courage which youth always demands in those whom it is to esteem. The average student is a discerning observer, who soon takes the measure of his instructor. It is not only the character of the instruction but also the character of the instructor that counts; and if the student has reason to believe that the instructor is not true to himself, the virtue of the instruction as an educative force is incalculably diminished. There must be in the mind of the teacher no mental reservation. He must give the student the best of what he has and what he is.[2]

The AAUP statement of Principles of Academic Freedom and Tenure of 1940 summarized the essential components of academic freedom:

A. The teacher is entitled to full freedom in research and in the publication of the results, subject to the adequate performance of his other academic duties; but research for pecuniary return should be based upon an understanding with the authorities of the institution.
B. The teacher is entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing his subject, but he should be careful not to introduce into his teaching controversial matter which has no relation to his subject. Limitations of academic freedom because of the religious or other aims of the institution should be clearly stated in writing at the time of the appointment.
C. The college or university teacher is a citizen, a member of a learned profession, and an officer of an educational institution. When he speaks or writes as a citizen, he should be free from institutional censorship or discipline, but his special position in the community imposes special obligations. As a man of learning and an educational officer, he should remember that the public may judge his profession and his institution by his utterances. Hence he should at all times be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others, and should make every effort to indicate that he is not an institutional spokesman.[3]

The University at Albany is committed to preserving these rights of free inquiry and discussion, and to maintaining the high standards of scholarship which are attendant to such rights.

There is a fifth way to characterize a university. It *offers undergraduate and graduate degrees, including the most advanced graduate degrees, in a wide range of liberal and professional fields of study.* Knowledge has become so vast in the Twentieth Century that no single institution can be expected to develop in *every* field, and the financial constraints which emerged in the 1970's abjure every institution to avoid programmatic over-commitment. Without a reasonably broad range of undergraduate and graduate offerings in the humanities, fine arts, sciences, social sciences, and selected professional fields, however, an institution cannot lay claim to being a university.

This arises partially from the need to offer a range of programs essential to a liberal education, but it arises more forcefully from the fact that no discipline or field of study is an intellectual island. The fields of knowledge are interrelated. In many instances the mutually reinforcing nature of disciplines and fields is readily apparent, especially within the broad intellectual families which form natural groupings within a university. Interactions between these broad families exist even if not readily apparent. For example, the humanities, natural sciences, and social sciences provide much of the theoretical underpinnings for advanced study in a variety of professional fields. In turn, the construction and testing of theories in the professional schools reinforces and adds to the store of knowledge in the underlying disciplines.

Finally, a university must be *committed to standards of quality which earn it respect in all of its communities of interest, including the national and international community of universities.* Excellence in teaching, high standards of scholarship, and fruitful address to public service make up the currency by which a university earns honored place in society. The meaning of "quality" is often blurred by disagreements over appropriate measurements, but this only directs us toward the development of elegant, effective, and rigorous modes of measurement.

The State University of New York at Albany is committed to all of the fundamental attributes of a university of the first class. It is through a shared commitment to such values that faculty, staff, and students are able to work together, both formally and informally, to shape the policies of the institution.

2. General Report of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure presented to and adopted by the Annual Meeting of the Association, December 31, 1915. *Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors,* Vol. 1, Part 1 (December 1915), p. 28.

3. "Academic Freedom and Tenure," Statement of principles endorsed at the annual meeting of the Association on January 9, 1941. *Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors,* Vol. 27, Number 1 (February 1941), p. 41.

PART II: THE INSTITUTIONAL SETTING

The common values of universities form a philosophic framework for goal-setting, but the character of every university is shaped also by the environment in which it exists and in which it acts out the basic values. A university builds its identity in part by its responsible adaptation to the constraints and opportunities of its own setting.

The University at Albany is conditioned by two major elements of environment: its membership in the State University of New York system, and its location in the Capital District of New York. Both elements pose obligations and opportunities.

The SUNY System

The State University of New York is the largest system of public higher education in the world. Comprising 64 institutions, it enrolled approximately 343,000 students in Fall 1976. By type, the constituent campuses include 30 community colleges; six agricultural and technical colleges; three specialized colleges, five statutory colleges; 14 arts and sciences colleges; two health science centers; and four university centers. Together the campuses offer the full range of postsecondary education from introductory to advanced levels. Advanced graduate and professional studies are concentrated in the four university centers at Albany, Binghamton, Buffalo, and Stony

Brook. The centers, which also admit undergraduate students, account for about one-sixth of SUNY enrollments. The Albany campus currently enrolls 14,673 students on all levels.

The University at Albany, as with the other university centers, has certain characteristics which distinguish it from other types of institutions in the system:

- It maintains an emphasis on research and teaching which stresses integration of the two activities and excellence in each.
- It maintains an extensive faculty of productive scholars in the humanities, fine arts, social and behavioral sciences, natural sciences and mathematics, and selected professional fields.
- It offers a broad range of baccalaureate, master's, and doctoral degree programs in these fields of study.
- Its laboratories, libraries, and other physical facilities are those of a research university. The library is one of the 105 members of the Association of Research Libraries.
- Its enrollment mix includes a significant proportion of graduate and advanced professional students (about one-third) with an admixture of out-of-state and foreign students.
- Its intellectual climate is that of a research university in which the presence of broadly educated advanced students is a stimulation and challenge to beginning students.

These general features, common to each of the university centers, establish a context for their work which is distinctly national and international in character. Advanced degree holders graduating from the centers are competing nationally for employment. The University at Albany's various programs in international education, including the newly-established graduate exchange with Moscow State University, express the international character of campus interests.

While performing its role in this broader context, the University at Albany also serves many local and regional needs. Again it shares these local characteristics and responsibilities with the other university centers.

- It draws its full- and part-time student population heavily and broadly from New York State at the same time that a limited number of out-of-state and foreign students are also enrolled. New York students, by acquaintance with these associates from other places, are drawn into a larger view of society.
- It offers a variety of cultural, clinical, and other activities which are designed to contribute to the development of students but which directly benefit area residents. Citizens of the Capital District attend campus cultural events, and they are frequently the beneficiaries of clinics and other organized activities related to instruction.
- It offers a variety of life-long learning opportunities for the population within its geographic region.
- Many members of the faculty find the topics and the materials for their scholarly inquiries in New York State, with the result that local and state problems are better understood while enlightenment is extended to national and international issues in which New York shares.
- The University Center is a major element of the regional economy, a principal employer of a highly trained work force and a major purchaser of goods and services.

These international, national, and regional characteristics of the Albany campus are compatible with the hallmarks of a university as outlined in Part I of this Mission Statement. Most fundamentally viewed, the Albany mission is to fill its place in the SUNY system by being a university of the first class, faithful to the values of universities everywhere and responsive to the opportunities of its wide region of the State of New York and the State Capital District.

* * * * * * * *

One frequently hears universities described as "national" or "regional," and the clear implication is that an institution must choose whether it is to be a "great university" or merely a local one. The criteria which go into drawing the distinction are never made explicit, however. The University at Albany rejects any notion that its national reputation is diminished by its attentions to local problems.

The dilemma is more apparent than real, because there are a number of reasons for saying that national and regional goals can be pursued compatibly. First, the very essence of a major university is its commitment to the advancement of knowledge, regardless of whether the immediate benefit to society is measurable or immeasurable, tangible or intangible, long-run or short-run. The advancement of knowledge is a primary goal of all disciplines and fields of study. Herein lies the greatest contribution a university can make to its local community or to the nation. When viewed in this way, the national and local dimensions of a university's work are mutually reinforcing and inseparable. Second, it is rare that the important issues and problems existing in one geographic region are of only nominal concern to another. Thus the expertise of a university can be brought to bear on basic issues which, although arising locally, are of universal concern. The advancement and application of knowledge to such issues can yield significant educational benefits to students and faculty, as well as to the local community. Third, the greatness of a university is judged by the *significance* of the issues its scholars addresss and by the *quality* of their address. These values know no geographic boundaries. If the conditions of universality are present, issues arising locally present opportunities for the discovery and application of knowledge *and* for dissemination of the research results to students, scholars and practitioners. The issue of a "national" versus "local" focus becomes moot because the obligations intrinsic to both are fulfilled.

The University Center at Albany can, and must, meet both sets of expectations in order to provide leadership as a public institution of higher learning in New York State.

Needs and Opportunities in the Capital Region: An Institutional Focus on Public Policy Analysis

Location in the Capital District of New York presents unique needs and opportunities to the University at Albany. The existing and potential strengths of the University, in turn, constitute a major resource for governmental, industrial, cultural, and other organizations of the District.

The University addresses the needs of many external constituencies already, of course, and in a variety of ways: applied research on problems of concern to government and other agencies; life-long learning opportunities for area residents; technical assistance to various organizations; student internships in the community; evening classes to improve educational access; public performances and exhibits in the arts; and the provision of qualified graduates. These and other forms of public service to the community are important and will continue.

In addition to fulfilling these general services, the university must be specially attuned to the needs and opportunities of its own geography. What major needs for knowledge in the region would constitute educational opportunities for faculty and students? In one important sense the answer varies by discipline and field of

study, as individual scholars engage in basic and applied research efforts which draw upon resources unique to the institution and its location. From a campus-wide perspective, however, the problem of choice looms large, because basic decisions must be made among programs and projects which legitimately could be given high priority as an institutional focus for the future.

The University at Albany will place high priority on basic and applied research efforts which address policy issues of broad public concern. It will thus build to a compelling opportunity. The State of New York is currently faced with a variety of policy issues related to economic development, education, environmental management, social services, crime and the administration of justice, social justice and equality, energy use, and other areas of concern to the public. In addressing such problems, agency heads, legislators and other government officials are charged with developing appropriate goals for enhancement of the public good, defining the appropriate means for achieving those goals, and monitoring the results and taking corrective action where necessary. Regardless of the specific area of concern, fulfillment of these general responsibilities requires a strong base of research and training in a variety of forms. It is within this context that the University can fruitfully intersect the process of policy formation – not necessarily through direct involvement in decision-making or implementation, but through generation of the knowledge needed to undergird that process. Our location in the seat of State government and our faculty competence provide a strong base for further development of an institutional emphasis on public policy analysis. The University has only begun to tap the vast learning laboratory which surrounds it.

Adoption of this focus can be accomplished in a way which reinforces the University's obligation to develop the intellectual capacities of students and to discover new knowledge. There are educational benefits to be gained for both students and faculty, as well as opportunities for the advancement of knowledge on a variety of fronts. At the same time that the region will be benefitted, the focus should also influence the national and international character of the University. The economic, social, and technological problems facing this State are not unique. Other regions of the nation and world have, or will have, many of the same concerns.

It is important to recognize clearly what an institutional emphasis on policy analysis must *not* mean, as well as what it can and should become.

First, the beneficiaries must be the general public and not merely the public's servants in government. The University cannot be captive to partisan interests, because its strength lies in an impartial search for the truth. Freedom of inquiry is fundamental to the nature of a university in this way as in all other ways. While important research questions often can be mutually identified by faculty and governmental officials, an independent and non-partisan view of the issues must be maintained.

Second, issues which are important to the State of New York will rarely be in geographic isolation. Policies on energy use or economic development, for example, cannot be formulated for New York without influencing, and being influenced by, policies for nulated in other states, at the federal level, and indeed in other countries of the world. The research perspective of the University cannot be geographically isolated, either, and must be as broad as the problems we seek to illuminate.

Third, it is important to stress that both basic and applied research are crucial to a focus on policy analysis. Not all faculty should be expected to engage in applied research, even in those units of the University which are or may become heavily committed to policy analysis. Support must be maintained for research which has little immediate relevance to public issues, but which provides the necessary theoretical base for more applied efforts. Without strong support for basic research in all programs, the intellectual horizons of policy analysis would become unduly limited. Knowledge must be *applied* if it is to avail solutions to public problems, however, and researchers who are interested in applications will be necessary to the enterprise.

The interests of public policy makers and the interests of faculty researchers will not always coincide, but they do intersect in potentially fruitful ways. In general, several criteria should be met in order for policy issues to be appropriate for address in the University setting:

- The issues and problems should be amenable to the application of rigorous research methodologies and techniques.
- They should not be so narrowly defined as to preclude generalizable conclusions.
- The benefits to be realized from address of the problems and issues should be of sufficient intellectual importance to warrant our commitment.
- Address to the issues and problems should yield significant educational benefits to students and faculty.
- The University should possess the expertise necessary for successful address to the issues and problems, or have the potential for attracting such expertise.
- The prerogative of the faculty to define the content and methodology of specific research efforts must be preserved in order to ensure freedom of inquiry and an independent, objective assessment of research results.

One mechanism for encouraging and facilitating policy research will be a university-wide Center for Governmental Research and Services, the role of which is discussed in Appendix B of this report.

* * * * * * * *

Finally and most fundamentally, it is necessary to recognize that a university may choose some special intellectual emphases for itself but it should not be wholly contained by those emphases. To contain knowledge is ultimately to kill learning. It is appropriate that the University at Albany give emphasis to public policy studies, because it is near to the seat of New York government and it possesses a strong base of faculty competence which can be brought to bear on policy issues. It is not likely, however, that all disciplines of the University will adopt such a focus, nor is it desirable that all do so. It is entirely appropriate that some disciplines have little or no direct impact on public policy formation, although there is no field of study which does not contribute to the education of students and therefore, in a broad sense, to the public good. We must preserve and nurture all disciplines which are essential for education of the whole person and be satisfied with nothing less than excellence in all that we do. The emphasis on matters of public policy is an enlargement of mission to embrace the needs and opportunities inherent in our immediate environment.

PART III: GOALS FOR STUDENT DEVELOPMENT

A statement of goals for student development should identify the desired outcomes, or results, of the University experience. In adopting this outcomes orientation, one must distinguish between the ultimate consequences of achieving the goals and the goals themselves. Achievement of whatever goals are set should contribute to the ability of students to (1) function effectively as educated persons in society; (2) assume the responsibilities of both leadership and citizenship within society; (3) engage in a life-long learning process of self-development; and (4) engage in meaningful and productive careers.

These consequences are a function of multiple variables, many of which are either beyond the scope of a university's work or beyond its control. Thus while a university cannot, indeed should not, assume full responsibility for the life success or failure (however defined) of its graduates, it must assume the responsibility for facilitating student development through accomplishment of the goals which it adopts as its rightful obligations.

A university distinguishes itself from other institutions in society by being specially concerned with the intellectual development of its students, with their growth in knowledge. Intellectual growth cannot occur separably from emotional, social, and physical development, however, and an effective learning environment recognizes and interrelates all of these aspects in order to foster wholesome personal achievement. A university must be committed to education of the whole person.

Students who matriculate in a university have already had at least 12 years of schooling, of course, and the skills and competencies that a university must impart are of the higher order that is appropriate to knowledge in its most advanced forms. Fields of study characterized by routine learning, which demand little of students beyond a simple acquisition of facts, do not attain to the level or the spirit of university studies. By contrast, university studies are of sufficient complexity to require advanced skills of analysis and critical thinking, a high order of methodological sophistication, and vigorous pursuit of the disciplines of learning. Students can be both "trained" in the specialized studies that lead to careers, and "educated" to a broader understanding of nature and mankind.

Students individually form and integrate their own goals for intellectual development, with an eye both to understanding the human condition and to career preparation, and their personal, social, and physical development proceeds as they do so. The university is obligated to be the environment in which such human development may advance in a wholesome fashion.

The philosophical goals stated below reflect the University at Albany's commitment to education of the whole person and constitute broad guidelines for the design of educational programs, curricula, and supporting services. Though implementation strategies will vary from area to area, the goals are applicable to undergraduate and graduate education as well as to offices of administrative services.

GOAL I. TO DEVELOP SKILLS OF CRITICAL THINKING AND REASONING

The University seeks to develop in students the ability to acquire both general and specialized knowledge; to integrate knowledge from a variety of perspectives; to apply alternative modes of reasoning and methods of problem solution; to distinguish the logically relevant from the irrelevant; and to derive and formulate general principles for clarification and explanation.

GOAL II. TO DEVELOP AND FOSTER THE PROCESS OF INTELLECTUAL DISCOVERY AND THE EXPLORATION OF THE UNKNOWN

By focusing on the creative elements of learning and the importance of fostering intellectual curiosity, the University encourages an awareness of the imaginative and creative elements of intellectual endeavor; develops in students a familiarity with the philosophies and methods of research in a variety of academic disciplines; and promotes an attitude of individuality which results in intellectual self-awareness and initiative.

GOAL III. TO DEVELOP AN AWARENESS OF AND INTEREST IN THE BREADTH OF HUMAN INTELLECTUAL ACHIEVEMENT AND CULTURAL EXPERIENCE

A broad understanding of world cultures and of the diversity of forms in which intellectual and artistic achievements have been expressed are important characteristics of the educated person. Students should be encouraged to gain an historical and integrated perspective of the cultural, political, legal, scientific, and social components of various societies and to understand the processes, complexities, and consequences of change. The University must also strive to foster a life-long interest in intellectual and aristic endeavors in order to ensure continuing personal development.

GOAL IV. TO FACILITATE EMOTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND CLARIFICATION OF PERSONAL VALUES

The University seeks to foster in students a positive self-concept, a feeling of personal worth and psychological well-being; to develop an awareness of how emotions, attitudes, and values influence thought and behavior; to encourage clarification of personal values; and to foster a sense of personal responsibility for one's views and acts.

GOAL V. TO FACILITATE SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT AND EFFECTIVENESS IN INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS

A wide range of communicative and leadership skills and the ability to interact effectively with others are essential attributes of an educated person, and the University must provide for development of these skills. Exposure to a variety of cultural and ethnic backgrounds is also a hallmark of the educated person, and the University is obligated to facilitate interaction and enhance understanding among the many segments of the University community.

GOAL VI. TO FACILITATE PHYSICAL DEVELOPMENT, HEALTH, AND WELL-BEING

The University is committed to the health, safety, and security of the University community, and provides physical activity, recreation, and other leisure-time activities necessary to the well-rounded development of students. We are obligated to create and maintain a healthy, clean, and psychologically and physically supportive campus environment that includes appropriate medical, housing, recreational, and educational programs.

GOAL VII. TO PREPARE STUDENTS FOR PERSONALLY SATISFYING CAREERS

The University has an obligation to develop in students the knowledge and skills required for employment and advancement in professional fields of endeavor. In those of our fields of study which have traditionally led to clearly

defined careers, the curriculum should equip students with the knowledge and skills necessary for entry level employment. In those fields which have not traditionally led to clearly defined careers, students should be encouraged to develop supplementary skills which would qualify them for career entry of some useful and remunerative nature. In seeking to achieve these results, the University also should provide a variety of opportunities for students to gain work experiences in appropriate fields; encourage an orientation to careers that recognizes both sequential and non-sequential employment patterns and considerations of life-style; provide appropriate career counseling to students; and give direct assistance in obtaining employment.

GOAL VIII. TO MAINTAIN A CAMPUS ENVIRONMENT WHICH WILL FOSTER A SENSE OF COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

A sense of community is critical to the achievement of all of the objectives of an institution of higher learning. The University must demonstrate, in its pursuit of learning, a commitment to the ideals and values of social responsibility, affirmative action, and equality of opportunity. The current epoch of United States history displays a strong American conscience about the condition of ethnic minorities in our culture—and the condition of women—and the University must assume its rightful obligations in bringing about social amelioration. These values must be communicated to students through words and example.

In addition, opportunities must continue to be provided for students to participate meaningfully in University decision-making processes, in community activities and governmental processes, and in a broad spectrum of cultural events. In general, what is sought is an atmosphere that will encourage students to explore and discuss contemporary social issues, to become aware of inherent conflicts in societal value choices, and to become committed to act upon their enlighted beliefs toward improvement of society.

* * * * * * * *

These Goals for Student Development are intended to reflect the full University experience and are, of necessity, stated broadly. It is the role of individual units within the University to articulate more precisely the goals of learning which are reflective of the unique discipline, field, or area of service to students. The desired outcomes discussed here apply to *all* students of the University at Albany and thus provide, in conjunction with Part IV of this document, the basic framework for goal articulation by academic and administrative units.

PART IV: GOALS FOR SOCIETAL DEVELOPMENT

The three basic functions of any major university are the discovery, transmittal, and application of knowledge on behalf of students and society. The functions are interrelated, of course, and they are accomplished through the activities of teaching, research, and consultation – each of which represents service to society. In this sense, "public service" is an outcome, or end result, of *all* our work and not some separately identifiable set of activities as commonly presumed. Such an understanding of "service" is long overdue in universities everywhere and necessary for full understanding of our goals and objectives for societal development. The following paragraphs discuss briefly the primary outcomes associated with the three major functions.

The potential benefits to society resulting from the *discovery of knowledge* are frequently unknown or unpredictable in any immediate sense, and even more difficult to measure. On the other hand, much knowledge discovered as a result of basic research in universities has had immediate visibility and utility to society. In general, discovery efforts have the primary outcome of advancement of knowledge, the visibility of which varies by discipline and field, but the importance of which has been demonstrated innumerable times. The University at Albany is committed to the discovery of knowledge for knowledge's sake, that foundation on which universities have been built as unique institutions within society.

With regard to the *application of knowledge*, the outcomes or benefits to society generally emerge from a problem-oriented focus, primarily through the activities of research and consultation. Thus, whereas the discovery function tends to be concept-oriented, the application function focuses initially on specific concerns of society. The distinction is often vague at best, and little is to be gained by attempting to classify too finely various types of research as "basic" or "applied." Nonetheless, the conceptual distinction is useful, particularly when addressing the larger issue of a university's role within society. In general, the result of the application function can be thought of as problem analysis, putting to work the varied resources of the university on important concerns of society or components thereof.

The first goal stated below reflects the University's commitment to research and scholarly inquiry for its own sake, as well as its commitment to utilize the results of such efforts, where appropriate, to assist in the solution of specific societal problems. Thus basic and applied research efforts contribute in equal importance to "societal development," and both demand a strong theoretical and methodological base within a university.

The *transmittal of knowledge* also has clearly identifiable outcomes to society. In some forms, the transmittal of knowledge is indistinguishable from its application, as students carry forth the results of classroom and laboratory work for use in later life. The university also has an obligation to transmit the results of its discoveries to students, the scholarly community, and the general public through books, journal articles, exhibitions, and other forms. As used here, however, transmittal in a university setting occurs primarily through teaching, whether that activity be for degree or non-degree students. In this sense, the primary outcome or result of transmittal is educated human beings. The goals for student development presented in Part III also apply here, but the University is also obligated to offer opportunities for lifelong learning which are uniquely directed to the local community. The second goal presented below reflects this obligation.

The transmittal of knowledge also occurs indirectly when cultural and clinical services are provided to the general public as part of the normal instructional process. For example, student internship programs of various types not only enhance learning, but also provide direct assistance to individuals and organizations in the local area. Similarly, productions or exhibits in the fine arts contribute importantly to student development and at the same time provide a valuable cultural resource for area residents. Thus, the third and final goal listed below

reflects the importance of such services in the life of a university.

In summary, the interrelated functions of discovery, application, and transmittal generate four major outcomes for society: *advancement of knowledge* (Goal I below); *problem analysis* (Goal I below); *educated people* (Goal II below, plus all the goals for student development presented in Part III of this document); and *cultural and clinical services* (Goal III below). "Public service" as used here is the overarching construct which embraces the four types of outcomes, because *all* our work is done on behalf of society. The analysis of public policy issues, for example, is only one form of problem analysis which, in turn, is only one of the four principal components of public service rendered by any major university.

In striving to achieve these goals, the University at Albany is firmly committed to high standards of social responsibility, including equality of opportunity and affirmative action in admissions decisions and in the hiring and retention of faculty and staff. Unless this commitment is fully realized in practice, the University cannot effectively discharge its obligations to the disadvantaged and to the larger society. The campus' Affirmative Action Plan reflects this commitment.

GOAL I. TO CONTRIBUTE TO THE GENERAL ADVANCEMENT OF KNOWLEDGE AND TO THE SOLUTION OF SOCIETAL PROBLEMS

The University must encourage individual faculty and students to undertake research and scholarly inquiry of any nature which promises to contribute to the advancement of knowledge. Where appropriate, research on policy issues of public concern also will be encouraged, recognizing that the address of such issues should meet the criteria outlined in Part II of this document. As a means of facilitating scholarly inquiry of all types, the University must strive to increase the level of financial support available for research and to develop more effective structures for interdisciplinary address of complex questions or problems. Finally, the communication of research findings to peers, students, and interested persons outside the academic community must be given adequate support.

GOAL II. TO OFFER OPPORTUNITIES FOR LIFE-LONG LEARNING AS AN INTEGRAL PART OF INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES

The University should offer degree and non-degree programs which are consistent with the needs of the learning society and with the capabilities of the University. All schools and departments are encouraged to offer life-long learning opportunities, both undergraduate and graduate, as appropriate to their missions; to provide, through course scheduling, and other means, the opportunity for qualified area residents to enroll in courses offered as a part of ongoing degree programs; to develop, where feasible, off-campus instructional programs to meet the needs of area residents; and to ensure that such offerings meet established standards of quality. The University should also seek to cooperate with other providers of life-long learning opportunities in the Capital District to ensure complementary offerings.

GOAL III. TO CONTRIBUTE TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE LOCAL AREA THROUGH THE PROVISION OF CULTURAL AND CLINICAL SERVICES WHICH REINFORCE EDUCATIONAL MISSION

This goal can be accomplished in a variety of ways: by integrating work-action experiences (e.g., internships, clinical experiences) for students into curricula as appropriate; by encouraging faculty to provide technical consulting assistance in the resolution of local problems; by providing a variety of cultural events for faculty, staff, students, and area residents; by making available the facilities of the University for use by appropriate community groups; and by providing other services to the community which are consistent with, and reinforce, the educational mission of the institution.

* * * * * * *

While the goals listed above provide a commonality of purpose for all units of the University, each contributes to their accomplishment in a variety of ways and with varying degrees of emphasis. Thus it is not intended that each unit pursue all of the goals outlined. *As an institution,* however, we must be committed to the pursuit of them all and develop more effective means for assessing our degree of goal attainment.

PART V: PROGRAMS AND PRIORITIES

Previous sections of this document have discussed the educational philosophy and general goals of the University at Albany and thus establish a basic framework for institutional development and behavior. We turn now to the criteria which are expected to underlie decisions on the academic and administrative priorities of the institution. The need for priority-setting arises even more forcefully under conditions of limited resources, and we must assume the following:

- There will be only slight growth in the total enrollment on this campus. The SUNY Master Plan currently allows for growth to 14,000 FTE students by 1984-85, or seven percent above the current level.
- There will be little or no increase in the number of faculty and staff positions funded by the State in the foreseeable future.
- The physical capacity of the University at Albany will remain virtually unchanged, although there will be some flexibility to change the character of existing space.
- Increases in the operating budget of the institution will likely be limited to inflationary adjustments over the next few years.

Thus the institution must prepare itself for a future which is "steady-state" insofar as the quantitative elements of growth are concerned. If managed properly, however, there are significant resource-related opportunities available to us:

- A limitation on total enrollments means that our attention can be centered on the qualitative aspects of growth, unfettered by erratic workload patterns and the usual crises associated therewith. Enrollment patterns *within* the University must be monitored closely to insure the attainment of educational goals.
- Although the total number of faculty funded by the State may remain constant, there will continue to be flexibility for the reallocation of positions.
- There are many first class programs and faculty now present on this campus. Selective development on a more compact operating front can expand those strengths still further. Although we must build from existing strengths, other programs critical to future mission will be improved where feasible.

• Our present physical capacity is sufficient, by and large, for the projected enrollments on this campus. With careful management of the space available, appropriate reallocations can be accomplished. Moreover, the *quality* of the physical plant is, by most yardsticks, excellent.

• While we may see no increases in the total operating budget aside from inflationary adjustments, there is flexibility for reallocation in this area also. By no means is our operating budget so small as to prevent the selective development of excellence on this campus.

These opportunities and constraints have several implications for future mission. First, resource allocation decisions must be guided by an explicit statement of priorities for the future. We can no longer expand on an even-handed basis, nor can all programs be developed to equivalent sizes or levels of quality. Second, we must increase our efforts at obtaining funds from non-State sources. New financial strategies must be developed to provide increased support for students and for faculty research, and to support the further development of selected programs. Third, the budgeting process of the future must be strongly influenced by a reallocative approach, the major objective being to provide those resources necessary for attainment of the goals established and for elimination of inequities in staffing which may exist. Finally, we must intensify efforts to identify ways by which costs can be reduced without corresponding reductions in effectiveness.

Academic Program Offerings

All universities are constrained in their range of program offerings for both educational and economic reasons. The reduction of twenty degree programs (later changed to 18) on the Albany campus this past year reflected a shared realization that an inventory of 129 programs could not be supported at the requisite level of quality in the years ahead. The range of programs sustained is befitting of a university, however, and the work of the Presidential Task Force on Priorities and Resources left the institution wholesomely formed for the future.

The Task Force members did not have the benefit of a written statement of mission to guide their deliberations. Nonetheless, there was ready comprehension of the general future of this University, especially its role as a major university center, the nature of any university's obligations to students and to society, and the increasing attention to be given to policy issues of public concern. The criteria used for program evaluation constitute evidence of this understanding, as does the final report itself.

The President's Report on Priorities and Resources, dated March 15, 1976, set forth the programs to be sustained on the Albany campus. As indicated below, the inventory includes 42 programs at the bachelor's level (including five interdisciplinary programs), 48 at the master's level, 21 at the doctoral level, and eight University certificate programs. In addition, the University will continue its commitment to the Educational Opportunities Program, to which we admit students who have the potential to engage in university-level work but who have some deficiency in academic preparation and who are economically disadvantaged.

Bachelor's Degree Programs

Division of Humanities: (15) – Art, Classics (Greek, Latin, and Greek & Roman Civilization), English, French, German, Italian, Judaic Studies, Music, Philosophy, Rhetoric & Communication, Russian, Spanish, Theatre. (Course sequences will continue in Art History and Polish.)

Division of Social & Behavioral Sciences: (9) – African & Afro-American Studies, Anthropology, Economics, Geography, History, Psychology, Puerto Rican Studies, Social Studies, Sociology.

Division of Science and Mathematics: (8) – Atmospheric Science, Biology, Chemistry, Earth Science, Geology, Mathematics, Medical Technology, Physics, (A second field will continue in Computer Science.)

School of Education: (1) – Business Education. (A second field will continue in Education.)

School of Business: (2) – Accounting, Business Administration.

School of Public Affairs: (1) – Political Science.

School of Social Welfare: (1) – Social Welfare.

Interdisciplinary Programs: (5) – Asian Studies, Chinese, Computer Science & Applied Math, Linguistics, Russian & East European Studies. (Interdisciplinary second fields will continue in Journalism, Peace Studies, Urban Studies and Women's Studies. Several departments will also continue to offer courses in environmental analysis.)

Master's Degree Programs

Division of Humanities: (13) – Classics (Classical Archeology, Greek, and Latin), English, French, German, Italian, Philosophy, Rhetoric & Communication, Russian, Spanish, Studio Art, Theatre.

Division of Social & Behavioral Sciences: (8) – African & Afro-American Studies, Anthropology, Economics, Geography, History, Psychology, Social Studies, Sociology.

Division of Science and Mathematics: (7) – Atmospheric Science, Biology, Chemistry, Computer Science, Geology, Mathematics, Physics.

School of Education: (12) – Counseling, Curriculum Planning, Educational Administration, Educational Communications, Educational Psychology, General Professional, Reading, Rehabilitation Counseling, Special Education, Student Personnel Services, Teacher Education, TESL – Bilingual Education.

School of Business: (2) – Accounting, Business Administration.

School of Library and Information Science: (1)

School of Social Welfare: (1)

School of Criminal Justice: (1)

School of Public Affairs: (3) – Political Science, Public Administration, Public Affairs.

Doctoral Degree Programs

Division of Humanities: (4) – English (Ph.D. and D.A.), German, Philosophy, Spanish.

Division of Social & Behavioral Sciences: (5) – Anthropology, Economics, History, Psychology, Sociology, (temporarily suspended).

Division of Science and Mathematics: (6) – Atmospheric Science, Biology, Chemistry, Geology, Mathematics, Physics.

School of Education: (2) – Ph.D., Ed.D.

School of Criminal Justice: (1)

School of Public Affairs: (2) – Political Science, Public Administration.

School of Social Welfare: (1) – (temporarily suspended)

University Certificate Programs

School of Education: (7) – Counseling, Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Administration, Educational Communications, Educational Research, Reading, Student Personnel Services.

School of Education and Social & Behavioral Sciences: (1) – School Psychology.

This program array represents a rich diversity of disciplines and fields, encompassing the humanities, fine arts, social sciences, natural sciences, and selected professional schools. Accompanying the diversity is a high degree of intellectual interdependence, and a shared commitment to those values and principles of

scholarly inquiry which are at the very heart of a university.

There are four major expectations of *all* programs being sustained:

- Achievement of a level of quality befitting a university center, as measured by rigorous national standards of scholarship.
- Development and pursuit of goals and objectives which reflect the unique character of the discipline or field, but which are also compatible with the overall goals of the University.
- Achievement of a balanced emphasis on teaching and research.
- Implementation of faculty evaluation, reward, and development plans which are appropriate to a university center.

These expectations constitute the primary focal points for coordination and oversight of programs from a campus-wide perspective. The forms of scholarship to be taken as evidence of achievement will differ across academic units, but there should be no variations in the level of accomplishment expected. Continued development as a university center demands the maintenance of high performance standards for both students and faculty in all programs offered on the Albany campus. As a corollary, the University must provide all programs being sustained the support needed to fulfill this commitment to quality.

Academic Priorities

A statement of program priorities reflects the fact that, during a given period of the institution's life, some programs need additional resources and/or attention more than do others. There are three principal factors to be considered in identifying those academic units which are primary claimants on resources:

- The obligation of the institution to provide *all* programs the resources needed to achieve an acceptable level of quality and to accommodate planned enrollments.
- The obligation of the institution to facilitate the attainment of national leadership in programs which are at or near that level of quality already.
- The need to further develop instructional and research activities in those units which can contribute significantly to the analysis of major public policy issues.

The first of the three major factors establishes a floor, a threshold of resources which must be provided to all academic units being sustained. The question which must be given a satisfactory answer can be stated thusly: What is the critical mass of scholars and support resources needed in a given unit to (a) provide the needed breadth and depth of intellectual expertise, (b) accommodate planned enrollments, and (c) accomplish the range of intellectual activities expected of all faculty at a major university center? Some quantitative workload indices can be employed to help answer this question, but all such factors must be weighed in relation to the unique features of a given discipline or field. Judgment is involved here, certainly, but these interrelated conditions must be satisfied in all programs to be offered on the Albany campus. Hence any unit which is judged to be below critical mass at a given time must be designated as a priority claimant on resources.

The second factor to be considered in delineating priorities takes cognizance of (a) the University's commitment to achieve peaks of excellence among its programs and (b) the obligation of the institution to facilitate and sustain extraordinary achievements on the part of its faculty. There are academic units on campus which have attained, or are close to attaining, national stature. Still others have strong potential to become recognized as among the leaders in the discipline or professional field. The University must nurture and facilitate extraordinary accomplishments in all possible ways, including the provision of increased resources when appropriate.

The third factor reflects the increased emphasis to be placed by the University on address to public policy matters. As discussed in Part II, this particular element of University mission can take a variety of forms and will be encouraged in all appropriate disciplines and fields. However, certain units or parts thereof have demonstrated special knowledge and skills which can be brought to bear rather directly and immediately on the economic, social, and scientific problems facing the State of New York. Such units will be given particular encouragement to expand their work in policy analysis and thus to contribute to fulfilling this element of mission.

Appendix A identifies those academic units which, based on the three principal criteria, emerge as primary claimants on resources at this time. Any listing of priorities must be tempered by the uncertainty of future allocations by the State, and by the knowledge that the needs of specific programs can shift rapidly in a short period of time. The existence of such uncertainty does not make less important the need for institutional planning, however, as individual academic units must be given more adequate lead time for recruitment and internal planning in general. Uncertainty as to future events means only that we must build a degree of flexibility into planned allocations and recognize that any resource may be subject to change in one or more of its parts. Thus the *intent* for future allocations can be clearly established, while recognizing that deviations from the plan may be necessary as external events unfold and as unanticipated needs emerge in specific programs.

Most of the priority concerns of an institution are directly related to the needs of academic schools and departments. However there also are educational matters which transcend disciplinary boundaries and merit special attention by the institution as a whole during given time periods. As eleaborated more fully in Appendix A, there are five such matters which are of particular importance at this time: review of the undergraduate experience; assessment of learning outcomes; interdisciplinary studies; international education; and the future enrollment mix of the University.

Administrative Functions and Priorities

The administrative, or non-instructional, staff of the University exist to facilitate and support the work of faculty and students and, in certain cases, to contribute directly to the development of students. In keeping with these purposes, major functions of administration are to:

- Initiate development of the institutional plans, policies and procedures necessary to preserve and enhance the vitality of the intellectual enterprise as a whole.
- Acquire the resources necessary to support teaching, research, and learning, both directly through its own efforts and indirectly through provision of information on funding sources and other matters to faculty and students.
- Develop and maintain programs and services which contribute directly to the intellectual, social, emotional, and physical development of students within the context of a total learning environment.
- Provide those administrative services to faculty and students which either directly support the learning process or are necessary to its existence.
- Maintain appropriate relationships with various external publics to facilitate the work of faculty and students and to satisfy accountability requirements in both educational and economic terms.
- Develop and maintain appropriate means of coordination and oversight to ensure that the goals and priorities of the institution are accomplished as effectively and efficiently as possible.

These major functions provide the framework within which all administra-

tive units must articulate their goals and objectives to support the educational mission of the institution.

The process of priority-setting among administrative units of the University follows much the same logic as for academic units. First, there are particular units which may be designated as primary claimants on resources during a given time period because they fall below the critical mass needed to fulfill their educational or administrative purposes. Second, there are broad issues which transcend the work of any particular unit and merit special study by the administration as a whole. Overriding these specific priorities is the University's commitment to nurture and support adequately *all* activities necessary to the learning environment. Appendix B delineates the major priorities for the administration at this time.

PART VI: TOWARD IMPLEMENTATION

This document has focused on defining the general goals and priorities of the University at Albany. It is a statement of intent, designed as a broad framework within which to describe and oversee future development of the institution. As such, it is intended to have a degree of permanence that enables individual units to develop their own longer-term goals and development strategies. The Mission Statement is nevertheless intended to be a working document, and not simply a periodic renewal of well-meant aspirations. It will achieve its purpose through implementation at two levels: the institutional process and the individual process.

The Institutional Process

The institutional process begins with preparation of three-year development plans by each academic and administrative unit. Each dean is currently coordinating, reviewing, and commenting upon plans within the school or division; similarly, each vice-president will be the focal point for administrative plans. All plans will be reviewed and discussed with appropriate academic and administrative officers during February, March, and April in order to achieve mutual understanding of future directions.

As this phase of discussions is completed, the priority criteria previously described (see Part V, above) can be applied to each plan as a basis for determining future resource allocations. The process should result in tentative allocations for 1978-79, thus providing a longer lead time for planning and recruitment than has been true in the past. The three-year horizon of the development plans will provide a future context for decisions, as well as make possible selective longer-term recruiting commitments for key positions.

Units will be asked to update their three-year development plans annually, thus providing a "moving" process whereby plans can incorporate new developments – for example, the results of external reviews or unforeseen changes in external conditions which may affect substantive elements of the plans. The campus-level mission statement will also be reviewed annually by the Council on Educational Policy to determine if changes are needed in overall goals and priorities of the institution. Every four years, the campus-level statement and the development plans of units will together provide the basis for preparation of the Master Plan required by SUNY-Central Administration. All these elements of institutional process provide the framework for continual assessment of goals and their degree of attainment.

The Individual Process

The major responsibility for implementing the University's mission rests, of course, with faculty, staff, and students. That responsibility is, in many instances, individual in nature. For example, it is the responsibility and prerogative of the faculty to define the content and methodology of research efforts. It is also the responsibility of the faculty member to define a course and to specify how it will be taught, subject only to review by peers through established curriculum review processes. Similarly, it is the responsibility of individual students to strive for self-development and to take advantage of the learning opportunities provided by the University.

In other cases the responsibility for implementation is corporate, such as in the preparation of each unit's development plan and in the work of the various task forces referred to throughout this document. Whether individual or corporate, however, faculty, staff, and students must assume the primary obligation for initiating the actions that will fulfill this statement of mission. It is not self-enacting; effective performance within its framework is dependent upon a shared commitment to the values and goals of the University at Albany.

APPENDIX A: ACADEMIC PRIORITIES

As explained in Part V, there are three major factors to be considered in establishing which academic units have prior claim on resources at this time:

- The obligation of the institution to provide all programs the resources needed to achieve an acceptable level of quality and to accommodate planned enrollments.
- The obligation of the institution to facilitate the attainment of national leadership in programs which are at or near that level of quality already.
- The need to further develop instructional and research activities in those units which can contribute significantly to the analysis of major public policy issues.

The first of the three factors establishes a floor, a threshold of resources which must be provided to all academic units being sustained. As a result of shifts in student interests over the years, changes in program purposes and scope, and other factors, a number of units currently fall below the resources required. The following departments and schools should be given a net increase in faculty lines and associated support funds as soon as is feasible:

Business
Computer Science
Economics
English (increased resource needs satisfied in 1976-77)
History (increased resource needs satisfied in 1976-77)
Psychology
Public Administration
Rhetoric and Communication
Social Welfare
Sociology

The composition of this list will vary over time, of course, as circumstances change and as units not now listed experience the need for increased resources.

The second factor reflects the commitment to facilitate the attainment of peaks

of excellence within the University. Based on external evaluations and other forms of evidence, the following units either have attained positions of national leadership already or have the potential to do so in a reasonable period of time:

Anthropology
Art
Atmospheric Science
Biology
Chemistry
Criminal Justice
Educational Psychology
Geology
German
Mathematics
Philosophy
Physics
Public Administration
Reading

Resource augmentation is not necessarily called for in order to facilitate the achievement and/or maintenance of very high quality in the units listed. However, the University must nurture and facilitate extraordinary accomplishments in all possible ways including the provision of increased resources when appropriate. The list is not immutable, of course, and should change as developmental efforts continue in other departments.

The third factor reflects the institutional emphasis on public policy analysis. The following schools and departments, or components thereof, have demonstrated special knowledge and skills which can be brought to bear on the economic, social, and scientific problems facing the State of New York:

Atmospheric Science
Business
Computer Science
Criminal Justice
Counseling and Personnel Services
Economics
Educational Policies, Programs and Institutions
Educational Psychology
Geography
Geology
Political Science
Psychology
Public Administration
Social Welfare
Sociology

While contributions to public policy analysis will be encouraged in many areas, the units listed above will be given particular encouragement in fulfilling this element of University mission.

Taking all three factors into account, 25 schools and departments emerge as primary claimants on resources at this time in order to (a) provide all units with an appropriate level of resources; (b) facilitate the attainment of national leadership; and (c) strengthen our work in public policy analysis. The University must and will fulfill its obligation to provide the critical mass of resources needed in *all* academic units.

In addition to these unit priorities, Part V identified five educational concerns which need special attention by the institution as a whole at this time:

Review of the undergraduate experience – In keeping with the emphasis placed on education of the whole person in Part III, it is important to identify the desired outcomes of a liberal education and the most appropriate means for attaining those outcomes. The Special Committee to Review the Undergraduate Experience is already at work on the matter and expects to submit its recommendations in late Spring 1977. The Committee's report will be reviewed by appropriate governance bodies before final action is taken on any recommendations.

Assessment of learning outcomes – While institutions of higher education long have been concerned with the results of the learning process, little progress has been made in developing appropriate methods for assessing these results. The results of much of the University's work cannot be measured in a quantitative sense, to be sure, but we must develop more effective means for assessing how well we are doing in relation to goals established. It is important educationally that we evaluate results, and it is also important to provide the general public with evidence of accomplishments.

This stronger orientation toward a focus on learning outcomes and their assessment is being encouraged in all academic units of the University. For example, each unit has been encouraged to state its goals and objectives in terms of desired learning outcomes as a part of the three-year development plans now being prepared. This effort will yield new insights into both the benefits and limitations of such an approach.

Interdisciplinary studies. – As traditional intellectual families become increasingly interconnected, the ability to mount strong interdisciplinary programs will continue to be of major concern to all universities. A campus-wide mechanism is needed to ensure that needed programs are developed and, once in operation, given proper support and attention. The Special Committee to Review the Undergraduate Experience, the Undergraduate Academic Council, and the Office of the Academic Vice President are all addressing this issue, and recommendations for action should be forthcoming in 1977.

International education. – As indicated in Part III of the mission statement, an understanding and appreciation of world cultures is an integral component of liberal learning. An emphasis on international education can be achieved in a variety of ways: through area studies programs, both on-campus and overseas; through the study of foreign languages and literature; through comparative and cross-cultural approaches in selected courses, regardless of the discipline or field of study; through a diverse student body which includes international students; and through other facets of the total experience which can be developed and emphasized.

The Special Committee to Review the Undergraduate Experience will consider this vital component of a liberal education in its work, but the matter should be reviewed continually by the International Studies Advisory Committee and by appropriate governance bodies and departments.

The enrollment mix of the campus. – As discussed in Part V, the total enrollment level authorized for the University at Albany is unlikely to change significantly in the near future. This does not mean, however, that the enrollment mix (e.g., by major, level) will remain constant, nor does it mean that the future mix must be left to chance. If educational considerations are to be given equal weight with demographic phenomena, we must initiate a more balanced approach to enrollment planning – one which reflects not only student interests but also the program plans and priorities of the institution and the societal needs being served.

Departments have already been asked to project, on a tentative basis, the enrollments which are *educationally desirable* over the next three years. The projections will be modifed, of course, as departments prepare their plans over the coming months and as further discussions occur. Thus the campus-level guidelines at this stage of mission articulation must be limited to the following:

- The total enrollments on the Albany campus will not exceed the current Master Plan projections, i.e., 13,500 FTE students by 1980-81 and 14,000 FTE students by 1984-85. The total FTE enrollment in 1975-76 was approximately 13,175.
- On a headcount basis, the campus will seek to maintain the current mix of approximately two-thirds undergraduate students and one-third graduate.
- Recruitment efforts will be increased to ensure attraction of high quality students and to facilitate the enrollment of students with the potential for advanced work.
- New approaches will be developed to attract additional financial support for graduate students (see Appendix B).

APPENDIX B: ADMINISTRATIVE PRIORITIES

Part V of the mission statement indicated two major categories of administrative priorities: (1) those administrative units which may be identified as primary claimants on resources at this time, and (2) those broad issues which transcend the work of any particular unit and which merit special address by the institution. The development of departmental plans with a strong focus on the support of educational mission will provide much of the information needed for decisions on priorities in the first category. Thus the following focuses on the priorities for action which transcend the responsibilities of specific offices and deserve immediate attention by the administration.

Facilitation of Research

As defined in Part V of this report, the term "research" refers to a broad array of scholarly and artistic activities which differ considerably in form, content, and process across fields of study in the University. Faculty members at a university center assume an obligation to be engaged in creative forms of scholarly inquiry, and the administration, in turn, has an obligation to facilitate such activity in all ways possible. While facilitation is often constrained by requirements emanating from external sources, there are, nonetheless, ways by which both the quality and quantity of support for research can be improved. The following actions are either already underway or planned for the near future.

- A study was initiated in the Fall of 1976 to develop new methods of encouraging and facilitating research activities on a campus-wide basis. In general, the focus of the project is on (a) the elimination of any barriers to research which may exist; (b) the creation of appropriate incentives in a variety of forms; and (c) development of the means by which the research-related goals of the University can be most effectively accomplished.
- Through redeployment within the administration, one full-time professional staff member will be added to the Office of Research. Addition of this staff member will enable the office to expand its capability for establishing appropriate relationships with granting agencies, disseminating information on funding opportunities to researchers, and otherwise facilitating the conduct of research activities on a campus-wide basis. The new staff member will devote special attention to increasing the amount of external support for the humanities and fine arts.
- As discussed more fully below, plans are underway to establish a research center which will play a major role in facilitating and encouraging research on public policy issues throughout the campus.

In addition to these specific actions, the administration will continue to seek out new sources of funding and take other appropriate steps to encourage research activities of faculty.

Increased Support for Graduate Students

State-appropriated stipends for teaching assistants and graduate assistants at the University at Albany have remained at the same level for six years, and recent reductions in the various forms of State financial aid have only exacerbated the problem. The campus must continue to take the initiative in finding new sources of funding for graduate students and in developing appropriate methods for attracting high quality students to our advanced programs.

A campus-wide task force has been created to study the problems of recruitment and financial aid and to develop a recommended plan of action for the University. This task force, appointed in cooperation with the Graduate Academic Council, is expected to submit its recommendations early in 1977. Our continued development as a major university center will depend to a large extent on our ability to attract and support graduate students of high quality, and we must act now to prevent further erosion of our competitive position.

Increased Non-State Support

As discussed in Part II of this document, there is likely to be little increase in the level of operating support provided by the State in the foreseeable future. Consequently, new financial strategies must be developed to provide increased support from non-State sources to further develop selected programs.

With the help of the SUNYA Foundation, the Benevolent Association, and the Alumni Association, a major effort will be made during 1976-77 to develop such strategies. The Vice President for University Affairs has been assigned primary responsibility for this task, and it is expected that a recommended plan of action will be developed by March, 1977.

Interaction with State Government

Contained in the 1977-78 Final Budget Request of this campus is a proposal to establish a University-wide center for governmental research and services. This Center, to be funded through redeployment of non-instructional resources, will have as its major purpose the enhancement of research on policy issues. The number of permanent staff in the Center will be no more than two or three, and its focus will be on encouraging faculty in the professional schools and in the arts and sciences to work together on substantive policy questions in various areas (e.g., educational policy, the physical environment, business and economic development). A number of rotating appointments will be made available to faculty in order to provide released time for research and achieve more effective coordination of effort. An advisory group of faculty also will be established to enhance the effectiveness of the Center.

In order to achieve its general purpose, the five major goals of the proposed Center will be:

- To stimulate faculty and student research on major issues and problems, by (a) arranging meetings with appropriate public officials, (b) assisting faculty and students in identifying research questions which are appropriate to a university setting, and (c) obtaining support for research from appropriate sources.
- To initiate major research projects and to establish the means for bringing a variety of discipline-based skills to bear on problems of multi-disciplinary or interdisciplinary character.
- To organize and maintain continuous liaison with agency heads, legislators, and other public officials to identify major issues and problems facing the State.
- To maintain a current University-wide inventory of faculty strengths and areas of expertise and to communicate the existence of such expertise to appropriate groups and individuals.
- To coordinate the development of conferences, workshops, and other appropriate vehicles for sharing knowledge with government officials.

If approved, the center will represent a major vehicle for implementing that element of University mission focusing on public policy analysis.

One step to be taken this year is a series of conferences on campus to identify projects of mutual interest to faculty, on the one hand, and key government officials on the other. These conferences will include workshops and deliberative sessions which focus on key policy issues and the nature of the University-Government interface in addressing those issues.

A second major action to be taken is the appointment of an advisory group to the President. This group will be convened at appropriate intervals to discuss specific needs of State government and the University's role in meeting such needs.

Reduction of Administrative Costs

All campuses of the State University of New York have limited flexibility in the allocation of resources between academic programs and administrative departments. Externally imposed requirements for accountability, for example, have costs associated with them that cannot be avoided. In addition, the budget structure itself limits the degree to which a savings in administrative costs can be translated into a gain for academic programs. Despite these limitations, we must continually seek ways by which administrative costs can be reduced and the savings redirected to academic programs or to units in direct support thereof.

The Presidential Task Force on Priorities and Resources suggested several alternatives for further study, all of which will be addressed during 1976-77. Some studies are already underway, and several promise to achieve significant cost reductions (e.g., secretarial pooling, elimination of unneeded telephone instruments and lines). A major effort is also underway to automate the operations of some administrative offices. In addition to these special studies, all administrative units are being urged to reduce costs of present operations to the extent practicable.

* * * * * * * *

In summary, five major areas are identified as priorities for administrative action: more effective facilitation of research; development of increased support for graduate students; development of an increased level of non-State financial support; creation of more effective liaison relationships with State government; and reduction of administrative costs to the extent practicable. Several specific action strategies are indicated in each of these areas, with others to be developed as the planning process evolves.